

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,981	10/813,981 03/31/2004		Christine Martz	MARTZ_FRAGRANT JEWELRY FU	5917
4988	7590	02/02/2006		EXAM	INER
ALFRED N 225 OLD C			REESE, DAVID C		
MELVILLE, NY 11747-2712				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3677	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/813,981	MARTZ, CHRISTINE				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	David C. Reese	3677				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 M	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 March 2004</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	•					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-24 is/are withdrawn 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 25-29 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/813,981 Page 2

Art Unit: 3677

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

[1] Claims 1-24 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Applicant timely did not traverse the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 11/23/2006; so therefore, the election is treated as an election without traverse.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Status of Claims

[2] Claims 1-29 are pending.

Claim Objections

[3] Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is slightly unclear, in the instant claim terminology, as to whether the fragrance is infused in both the continuous necklace and the headband piece or just the headband piece. Consider changing said claim to read:

"...continuous necklace and a headband piece that is infused with fragrance".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

[4] The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3677

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

[5] Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e(1)) as clearly anticipated by Putz, US-2002/0117556, because the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, or in public use or on sale in this country more than one (1) year prior to the application for patent in the United States.

The shape and appearance of Putz is identical in all material respects to that of the claimed design, *Hupp v. Siroflex of America Inc.*, 122 F.3d 1456, 43 USPQ2d 1887 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

As for Claim 25, Putz teaches of a fragrant decorative necklace and headband (Figs. 2, 19) comprising:

an elastic (28, 828) decorative continuous necklace and headband piece (20, 822) infused with fragrance (via 22, 822), said continuous necklace and headband piece (Figs. 2, 19) [configured to be] worn either as a necklace and as a hair accessory.

The above statement in brackets is an example of intended use, as it fails to further limit the structure of the claimed invention. The prior art must only be capable of performing such a use, and the invention as disclosed by Putz is capable of being worn as either a necklace and/or hair accessory. Note that it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 *USPQ2d* 1647 (1987).

Art Unit: 3677

Re: Claim 26, wherein said necklace and headband (Fig. 19) comprises a string of beads having beads strung on an elastic cord (828), and a pendant (826 in Fig. 19) attached to said cord (828).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- [6] The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- [7] Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Putz, US-2002/0117556.

Although the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth 35 U.S.C. 102, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a designer having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains, the invention is not patentable.

The difference between the claim and Putz is that the claim states of the fragrance emitting member being adhesively attached to a pendant. Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known to use adhesives as one of the many possible fastening methods for attaching two materials in both fragrance jewelry, and the entirety of jewelry art as well. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replaced outside bezel structure (back of 826 in Fig. 9) in Putz with an adhesive helping attach the fragrance emitting member 822 to the bezel 826.

Art Unit: 3677

Re: Claim 28, Putz teaches wherein said fragrance emitting element (822) includes a portion (822 in Fig. 19) thereof exposed upon contact to a user's skin when said string of beads is worn as a necklace (828).

Re: Claim 29, Putz teaches wherein said fragrance emitting element (822) is an annular band (822) located upon said pendant (826), said annular band (822) exposed upon contact to a user's skin when said string of beads (828) is worn as a necklace.

Conclusion

[8] The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited further to show the state of the art with respect to this particular type of jewelry item; as well as their extreme relevance to the current application as many read extensively onto the claimed invention: please see submitted notice of reference cited.

[9] Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David C. Reese whose telephone number is (571) 272-7082. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am-6:00 pm Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J.J. Swann can be reached at (571) 272-7075. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is the following: (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Reese Assistant Examiner Art Unit 3677

Page 5

ROBERT J. SANDY PRIMARY EXAMINER

DCR

1/23/06